arXiv:1408.5785v4 [math.OC] 7 Apr 2015

The variational structure of the space of holonomic measures

Rodolfo Ríos-Zertuche

To Xavier Gómez-Mont Ávalos

Abstract

Roughly speaking, holonomic measures are parametric varifolds without boundary. They provide a setting appropriate for the analysis of many variational problems. In this paper, we characterize the space of variations for these objects, and we use the characterization to formulate stability conditions that are strictly more general than the Euler-Lagrange equations. We also use this characterization to deduce higher-dimensional analogues of energy conservation and weak KAM.

Along the way, we characterize the distributions that arise as derivatives of families of Borel probability measures on smooth manifolds.

Contents

1 Introduction **2**

1.1 Introductory example: length-minimizing curves have no corners . . . 3

1.2 Examples of Lagrangians . . . 6

1.3 Related literature. . . . 8

1.4 Acknowledgements. . . . 9

2 Distributions that arise as derivatives of families of measures **10**

2.1 Distributions and measures . . . 11

2.1.1 Convolutions . . . 11

2.1.2 Definition and smoothing of distributions . . . 11

2.1.3 Structure . . . 12

2.2 Variations . . . 14

2.2.1 Two-sided derivatives . . . 14

2.2.2 One-sided derivatives 20
2.3 Flows 20

3 Preliminaries on holonomic measures 22
3.1 Setting 22
3.2 Definition of holonomic measures and their topology 23

4 The holonomic tangent space 26
4.1 Mild distributions 26
4.2 Two-sided variations of holonomic measures 26
4.3 One-sided variations of holonomic measures 28

5 Examples 29
5.1 Criticality 29
5.2 Horizontal variations 30
5.3 Vertical variations 32
5.4 Transpositional variations 34

1 Introduction

In this paper we consider the space of holonomic measures on a manifold M with tangent bundle TM. These are roughly speaking all Borel measures on $T^nM = TM \oplus \cdots \oplus TM$ that can be approximated by n-dimensional cycles. One can also say that they are parametric varifolds without boundary, because they induce a varifold and also encode a local parameterization for it. These are defined carefully in Section 3.

We study the ways in which these measures can be deformed, thus characterizing the velocity vectors of all curves in the space of holonomic measures that are differentiable in a certain sense. We are thus able to give a good description of the tangent bundle to the space of holonomic measures. We do this in Section 4.

This study is fruitful, as is shown by an initial set of applications presented in Section 5. Among other things, we are able to show that the conditions we obtain for criticality are effectively more general than the classical Euler-Lagrange equations. We also show analogues of energy conservation and of the weak KAM theorem, for which we are missing a regularity result however.

In order to achieve our goal, we prove a general characterization of all distributions that appear as derivatives of both signed, positive, and probability measures. We do this in Section 2.

In order to clarify the general ideas and goals of the paper, we present in Section 1.1 an example that illustrates the general philosophy, and in Section 1.2 a series of examples of different Lagrangians that could be studied using holonomic measures. We then present a brief survey of related literature in Section 1.3. In Section 1.4, we acknowledge the people and institutions that contributed to this work.

1.1 Introductory example: length-minimizing curves have no corners

Let M be the flat two-dimensional torus $M = \mathbb{R}^2/\mathbb{Z}^2$. Let $\gamma : [0, 2) \to M$ be a closed curve, given by

$$\gamma(s) = \begin{cases} (s, 0) & \mod \mathbb{Z}^2, \quad s \in [0, 1), \\ (0, s) & \mod \mathbb{Z}^2, \quad s \in [1, 2). \end{cases}$$

The curve γ induces a probability measure μ_γ on TM by pushing forward the uniform probability on $[0, 2)$ by use of the map $d\gamma\colon t \mapsto (\gamma(t), \gamma'(t))$. Thus, for measurable $f\colon TM \to \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int f \, d\mu_\gamma &= \frac{1}{2} \int_0^2 f(\gamma(t), \gamma'(t)) \, dt \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 f((s, 0), (1, 0)) \, dt + \frac{1}{2} \int_1^2 f((0, s), (0, 1)) \, dt. \end{aligned}$$

The support of μ_γ is exactly the set of velocity vectors of γ. The measure μ_γ is an example of what we call a holonomic measure. It encodes a 1-dimensional submanifold with a singularity at $(0, 0)$, together with its parameterization. Note that at the origin $(0, 0)$ the two components of γ cross, so that there are two tangent vectors:

$$\operatorname{supp} \mu_\gamma \cap T_{(0,0)} M = \{(1, 0), (0, 1)\}. \tag{1}$$

In the traditional proof that our curve γ is not a geodesic, we would proceed by comparing its length with the length of a curve that takes "shortcuts" near $(0, 0)$ to cut the corner. Such a comparison proof is easy to complete in the simple case of a minimizer of 1-dimensional length, but it could be more difficult to produce such a construction in higher dimensions and for any smooth Lagrangian L.

We are interested in extracting as much information about the minimizers as can be obtained from doing variations of them. For example, we know



Figure 1: A variation of γ near $(0,0)$ at different times t for some $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$.

intuitively that there is some variation of our curve γ above that looks like the one in Figure 1. Let us call γ_t the curve in this variation corresponding to each time $t \in \mathbb{R}$. In this variation, at $t = 0$ we have the original curve γ. For negative t, we have a curve of length larger than that of γ. For positive t, the curves have length smaller than that of γ. We thus have

$$\left.\frac{d}{dt}\right|_{t=0} \text{length}(\gamma_t) < 0,$$

which immediately proves that γ cannot be a minimizer of the length.

Thus if we knew that such a variation existed every time the support of the measure μ_γ intersected a fiber of TM in two points, we would be able to conclude that minimizers cannot have corners.

This is all intuitively true, but the variation of Figure 1 is rather hard to write down. Instead of writing it down, we write down the desired derivative $d\gamma_t/dt|_{t=0}$ of the family of curves γ_t, and we compute the derivative $\frac{d}{dt}\big|_{t=0} \text{length}(\gamma_t)$. Theorem 19 will guarantee the existence of some variation with that derivative, like the one in Figure 1 — which we no longer need to construct explicitly.

Instead of trying to write down $\frac{d}{dt}\big|_{t=0}\gamma_t$, we consider the family of measures μ_t induced by the curves γ_t, and we write down the derivative $\frac{d}{dt}\big|_{t=0}\mu_t$, which will be a distribution η. Perhaps the main property of the family γ_t at 0 is that all the movement is (infinitesimally) happening precisely in the tangent space to $(0,0) \in M$, and the main component of the movement is really the change in the directions of the vectors tangent to the curve, which are infinitesimally getting closer as t increases, as illustrated in Figure 2. While the curve does move away from $(0,0)$, we can actually assume that that effect occurs as $O(t^2)$, and is hence not important for the derivative η. Thus we only need η to reflect the movement of the tangent vectors, and it should look like the scheme in Figure 3.

We need to make an interlude to explain how to represent movement with a distribution. The easiest example is to take the family of Dirac deltas δ_t on $\mathbb{R}$, which move with t. The derivative of the movement at 0 should be



Figure 2: Evolution of the tangent vectors to the curve γ of Figure 1 at the singular point.

Figure 3: Schematic representation of the derivative $\eta = \frac{d}{dt}\big|_{t=0}\mu_t$, deduced from Figure 2.

the tangent vector $v = (1)$ to $\mathbb{R}$. As a distribution, we see that

$$\frac{d}{dt}\bigg|_{t=0} \langle \delta_t, f \rangle = \frac{d}{dt}\bigg|_{t=0} f(t) = f'(0) = \langle -\partial\delta_0, f \rangle.$$

In other words, the derivative $\frac{d}{dt}\big|_{t=0}\delta_t = -\partial\delta_0$ is the distributional way to express movement from left to right on the real line, at $x = 0$.

To implement the movement schematized in Figure 3, we first see that the measure $\mu_0 = \mu_\gamma$, when restricted to $T_{(0,0)}M$, is really a sum of two deltas at the points of its support (compare with equation (1)). We want to move the one at $(1, 0)$ in the direction $(-1, 1)$, so we will have a derivative $-\partial_{(-1,1)}\delta_{((0,0),(1,0))}$. Similarly, the one at $(1, 0)$ should move in the direction $(1, -1)$, which gives a component $-\partial_{(1,-1)}\delta_{((0,0),(0,1))}$. (The derivatives act in the direction of the fibers of the tangent bundle.) In other words, we have the distribution η on TM given by

$$\eta = -\partial_{(-1,1)}\delta_{((0,0),(1,0))} - \partial_{(1,-1)}\delta_{((0,0),(0,1))}.$$

The conditions of Theorem 19 are easy to check. By Lemma 21, Condition (Pos) holds. Since $\langle \eta, 1 \rangle = 0$, Condition (Prob) holds. To see that Condition (Hol) holds, we pick $f \in C^\infty(M)$ and compute

$$\langle \eta, df \rangle = (f_x, f_y) \cdot ((-1, 1) + (1, -1)) = 0$$

so the condition is satisfied. This means that η is indeed the derivative of some family μ_t of holonomic measures.

Now, let us use this to check that γ is indeed not a geodesic. We let $L(x,v) = \sqrt{v \cdot v}$, so that the integral

$$\int L \, d\mu_\gamma = \int_0^2 |\gamma'(s)| \, ds = \text{length}(\gamma)$$

expresses the length functional as a Lagrangian action with Lagrangian density L. If γ were a critical point of this length functional, the derivative

$$\left.\frac{d}{dt}\right|_{t=0} \text{length}(\gamma_t) = \left.\frac{d}{dt}\right|_{t=0} \int L \, d\mu_t = \langle \eta, L \rangle$$

would vanish for all variations γ_t. Thus, since

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \eta, L \rangle &= \nabla|v| \cdot (-1,1)|_{v=(1,0)} + \nabla|v| \cdot (1,-1)|_{v=(0,1)} \\ &= \left.\frac{-v_1 + v_2}{|v|^3}\right|_{v=(1,0)} + \left.\frac{v_1 - v_2}{|v|^3}\right|_{v=(0,1)} = -1 - 1 = -2 \neq 0,\end{aligned}$$

we conclude that γ is not a critical point of the length, hence also not a minimizer. Which is what we expected from the intuition given to us from Figure 1.

In this particular case we are, of course, reaching for the sledgehammer to crack a nut. However, the examples of Section 5 will show that it is often easy and worthwhile to consider large families of variations and to extract infteresting information from them.

1.2 Examples of Lagrangians

Geometric measure theory has traditionally worried mostly about problems in which the Lagrangian has lots of symmetries. Good examples are the k-dimensional area (or mass), that is, when the Lagrangian is the volume vol_k induced by a Riemannian metric g on the manifold M, by

$$L(x, v_1, \ldots, v_n) = \text{vol}_k(v_1, \ldots, v_k) = \left|\det(g(v_i, v_j))_{i,j=1}^k\right|$$

and the classic mechanical Lagrangians, of the form

$$L(x,v) = \frac{1}{2} g(v,v) + V(x),$$

for some potential V. We want to argue that there are many interesting situations in which one cannot expect so much symmetry.

Example 1. Consider the case of socks, which are generally made of textile tissue with the property that it is more stretchy in one direction than in the other. In this case, an appropriate model would probably be of the form

$$L(x, v_1, v_2) = \mathrm{vol}_2(v_1, \beta v_2) + V(x)$$

where $0 < \beta \neq 1$ is a parameter that will account for the difference in stretchiness, and V is some potential (intended to keep the sock away from the foot). Notice that socks usually have seams, and the objects we propose, holonomic measures, allow for this.

Example 2. The construction of a flexible computer screen out of organic electronics to wrap a geometric body, such as could be used decoratively on an innovative architectural piece, would probably have different costs depending on the direction in which it were laid out, thus becoming the solution of an anisotropic Lagrangian optimization problem.

Example 3. A plant's stem can be thought of as a 3-dimensional cell minimizing an energy that is different in the longitudinal direction than in the radial direction, and for which the source of light matters. It is also likely that a position-dependent potential would have to be added to account for the problems that height brings, like difficulty in water transportation. Hence, the appropriate Lagrangian would be anisotropic and would have symmetry neither with respect to $\mathrm{GL}(d, \mathbb{R})$ (acting on TM) because the direction of the light matters, nor with respect to S_3 (acting on the indices of v_1, v_2, v_3) because longitudinal and radial growth have different costs.

Example 4. Another example is that of laminations that locally look like harmonic from a given manifold. In this case, the Lagrangian looks like an anisotropic quadratic form on the partial derivatives of the local parameterization.

While the existence of harmonic maps has been proved in some cases — notably in the case in which the target manifold has nonnegative sectional curvature [16]—, it is known that there are no harmonic maps in many other cases. For instance, there are no harmonic maps from the sphere S^2 into itself (see for example [27]). There is a body of literature devoted to suggesting alternatives to harmonic maps in the cases in which those do not exist. Using holonomic measures, one always gets an energy minimizer that may not correspond to an immersed manifold. It would be interesting to understand these minimizers more deeply.

1.3 Related literature.

Geometric measure theory and variational analysis are vast subjects, so a discussion about how this research fits in those contexts is in place. However, since it seems impossible to give an exhaustive discussion, we choose to instead give just a brief one and hence minimize the number of mistakes we make in the process. Also, we will not define all the objects involved, but rather we will just mention them in the hope that readers familiar with these concepts will find the information they are looking for, while readers not familiar with them will be happy to ignore the discussion.

Throughout this paper, $d \geq 1$ will denote the dimension of the ambient mainfold M, while $1 \leq n \leq d$ will denote the dimension of the holonomic measures. This roughly means that we are considering submanifolds of dimension n.

Holonomic measures appeared in the $n = 1$ case in Mather's [32] version of Mather-Aubry theory for minimizers of the action of Lagrangians on the torus. The theory of holonomic measures was extended by others; for example by Mañé [9,31], Bangert [5], Bernard [6]. A certain case of codimension one of Mather-Aubry theory was considered by Moser [34–36].

In the more general context we treat here, in which n can be arbitrary, a similar theory should exist for a large class of Lagrangians. Under rather mild conditions in the Lagrangian (such as convexity, coercivity superlinearity, tightness, quasiconvexity) minimizers exist in all holonomy classes with coefficients in the real numbers $\mathbb{R}$. However, analogues of Mather's α and β functions are probably only defined for a very restricted set of Lagrangians.

Holonomic measures induce superpositions of *currents* (cf. [20,33]) on a manifold M in an obvious way. However, they carry more information than currents because they take into account the parameterization and orientation of the minimizers, and hence allow for the study of anisotropic Lagrangians.

Holonomic measures also induce *varifolds* (cf. [1, 2, 41]). Again, they carry more information because they record not only the tangent planes, but also the velocity vectors of a 'parameterization,' and the orientation. Our characterization of the tangent bundle to the space of holonomic measures also implies a characterization of the space of first variations of a varifold, which turns out to be larger than the set considered traditionally since the work of Allard [1]; for a summary of that theory see for example [29].

Similarly, holonomic measures also have more structure than *sets of finite perimeter* (see for example [30]). Although in this paper we consider only objects without boundary (i.e., with empty perimeter), it is easy to use the variations of Proposition 18 of the present paper that are given in [40] to

get similar results to those explained here in the case in which the sets have boundary, and in those cases one should indeed require certain finiteness conditions.

The set of holonomic measures contains representations of the families of the *cone and cup competitors* and the *deformed competitors* for the direct approaches to Plateau's problem discussed in the recent papers [13, 15]. Again, those do not carry information about the parameterization or the orientation of the minimizers. Similar remarks correspond to the geometric approaches of [14, 18, 21, 24–26, 37–39]. The disadvantage of holonomic measures with respect to those lies in the lack of clear geometric structure (i.e., our set of 'competitors' is much larger and harder to describe *a priori*). A good review of other alternatives is given in [12].

With holonomic measures the issue of rectifiability is not a concern since rectifiability is built into them. Whether or not one can find their volume (or the action of a Lagrangian) depends on the question of whether this function is integrable with respect to them.

Holonomic measures are suitable for the treatment of many problems that could be approached parametrically using functions for example in Sobolev or Lipschitz spaces (cf. [11, 17, 23, 28]).

Superpositions of *Young measures* (cf. [6, 43]) are a special case of holonomic measures.

In Section 5.3 we deduce a sort of general Hamilton-Jacobi equation, a case of which has been studied to great depth (see for example [10, 19]).

The definition of differentiability of families of measures (i.e., of variations) that we use is only one possibility of many; see for example [42] for an exploration of other possibilities.

1.4 Acknowledgements.

I am deeply indebted to John N. Mather for his patience in listening to a number of sometimes very confused and tentative presentations of these results and for his help in clarifying my ideas with numerous questions and suggestions. I am also very grateful to Antonio Ache, Camilo Arias Abad, Victor Bangert, Patrick Bernard, Albert Fathi, Jesús Puente Arrubarrena, and Stefan Suhr for several conversations on this subject, to Gonzalo Contreras and Renato Iturriaga for introducing me to the calculus of variations, and to Burglind Juhl-Jöricke for teaching me what I know about distributions. I am also very grateful to Luigi Ambrosio for very helpful comments.

I am very grateful to Princeton University, to the Institute for Computational and Experimental Research in Mathematics at Brown University, and

to the Max Planck Institute for Mathematics in Bonn for their hospitality and support during the development of this research.

2 Distributions that arise as derivatives of families of measures

Throughout this section, let P be a C^∞ manifold of dimension m without boundary, and let μ be a Borel measure on P. Denote by $C_c^\infty(P)$ the space of smooth functions with compact support on P.

In this section, characterize the velocity vectors for curves in the space of Borel measures on P that pass through μ. These velocity vectors are given by certain distributions.

We find that if the measures μ_s are allowed to be signed (i.e., to have both positive and negative mass), then any distribution can arise; see Proposition 9. On the other hand, if the measures μ_s are only allowed to be positive, we find a necessary and sufficient condition for a given distribution to be the velocity vector of a curve through μ_0. This is Condition (Pos) below, which says that the nullspace of the distribution must contain all smooth, nonnegative functions that vanish on the support of μ_0. This characterization is our main result of the section, and it is given in Theorem 11. This theorem also accounts for the case in which all the measures μ_s are probabilities. We also look at the case of one-sided derivatives in Section 2.2.2.

In Section 2.3 we explain how one can use Colombeau algebras to build the bridge with the classical ideas of mass transport.

Interest in the variational structure of the space of measures, which we study here, comes from the applications that the analysis of measures has found for example in problems of optimal transport (e.g., [3, 4]) and optimization, as in Mather-Aubry theory (e.g., [9,32]). Differentiable families of measures have also been studied extensively for example in [42]. Our own applications appear in Section 4.

The variational structure of the space of measures has been explored, with a stronger topology that results in a smaller tangent space, in [4, Sections 8.4 and 8.5].

We give precise definitions and some preliminaries in Section 2.1, and we state and prove our result in Section 2.2. In Section 2.3 we give some comments regarding what these results mean for mass transport and flows.

2.1 Distributions and measures

2.1.1 Convolutions

A *mollifier* is a function $\psi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ such that $\psi(x) = \psi(-x)$, $\int \psi = 1$, and $\psi \geq 0$.

We will say that a tuple of vector fields $F = (F_1, \ldots, F_\ell)$ on P is *generating* if at every point $p \in P$ the vectors $F_1(p), \ldots, F_\ell(p)$ span all of the tangent space T_pP.

Fix a generating tuple of vector fields $F = (F_1, \ldots, F_\ell)$. Denote by $\phi^i : P \times \mathbb{R} \to P$ the *flow* of F_i:

$$\phi_0^i(x) = 0, \quad \frac{d\phi_s^i(x)}{ds} = F_i(\phi_s^i(x)), \quad s \in \mathbb{R}.$$

For $f \in C_c^\infty(P)$, we will denote by $P_i(f)$ the function given by

$$P_i(f)(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} f \circ \phi_s^i(x)\, \psi(s)\, ds.$$

This is a *convolution* in the direction F_i.

For $f \in C_c^\infty(P)$, we will denote

$$\psi *_F f := P_1 P_2 \cdots P_\ell(f).$$

2.1.2 Definition and smoothing of distributions

A *distribution* on the open set $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ is a linear functional $\eta : C_c^\infty(U) \to \mathbb{R}$ such that for each compact set $K \subset U$ there are some constants $N > 0$ and $C > 0$ (depending only on K and η) such that

$$|\langle \eta, f \rangle| \leq C \sum_{|I| \leq N} \sup_{p \in U} |\partial^I f(p)|$$

for all $f \in C_c^\infty(U)$. Here, the sum is taken over all multi-indices I with m nonnegative entries adding up to at most N, and ∂^I denotes the iterated partial derivatives in the corresponding directions in $\mathbb{R}^m$.

We fix, once and for all, an n-dimensional C^∞ manifold P without boundary, and with a Riemannian metric that induces the distance dist_P between points of P.

Let $\eta\colon C_c^\infty(P) \to \mathbb{R}$ be a linear functional. For a chart $\varepsilon\colon U \to W$ from the open set $U \subseteq P$ to the open set $W \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, the *pushforward* $\varepsilon_*\eta$ is defined by

$$\langle \varepsilon_* \eta, f \rangle = \langle \eta, f \circ \varepsilon \rangle$$

for f in $C_c^\infty(W)$.

The functional η is a *distribution* if for each chart ε as above, $\varepsilon_*\eta$ is a distribution on W. We will denote by $\mathscr{D}'(P)$ the space of distributions on P. The topology on $\mathscr{D}'(P)$ is induced by the seminorms

$$\eta \mapsto |\langle \eta, f\rangle|$$

for $f \in C_c^\infty(P)$. In other words, we have $\eta_i \to \eta$ if, and only if, $\langle \eta_i, f\rangle \to \langle \eta, f\rangle$ for all $f \in C_c^\infty(P)$. We remark that any measure on P determines a distribution, but that not all distributions arise in this way.

For a distribution $\eta \in \mathscr{D}'(P)$, we define the convolution by duality:

$$\langle \psi *_F \eta, f\rangle = \langle \eta, \psi *_F f\rangle.$$

Lemma 5. *If η is a distribution in $\mathscr{D}'(P)$, F is a generating tuple of vector fields, and ψ is a mollifier, then $\psi *_F \eta$ is a smooth signed Borel measure.*

For a proof see for example [22, §5.2].

2.1.3 Structure

We fix a generating tuple $F = (F_1, \dots, F_\ell)$ of vector fields. As before, we denote by I a multi-index $I = (i_1, \dots, i_\ell)$ with ℓ nonnegative entries, and by ∂^I the operator that iteratively takes i_j covariant derivatives in the direction F_j, $j = 1, \dots, \ell$.

As usual in the theory of distributions, we define derivatives of distributions ν by duality,

$$\langle \partial^I \nu, f\rangle = (-1)^{|I|}\langle \nu, \partial^I f\rangle,$$

and the *support* $\operatorname{supp}\nu$ of a distribution ν to be largest set such that if $f \in C_c^\infty(P)$ is supported outside $\operatorname{supp}\nu$ then $\langle \nu, f\rangle = 0$.

Lemma 6 (Structural representation in terms of measures)**.** *A distribution $\eta \in \mathscr{D}'(P)$ can be written as a sum*

$$\eta = \sum_I \partial^I \nu_I \tag{2}$$

where I ranges over all multi-indices as above; for each I, ν_I is a signed measure. For a compact set $K \subseteq P$,

$$K \cap \operatorname{supp}\nu_I = \varnothing$$

for all but finitely many multi-indices I.

Proof. Take a partition of unity $\{\xi_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{N}} \subseteq C_c^\infty(P)$ of P, that is, a countable set of smooth functions ξ_i with compact support such that $\sum_j \xi_j(p) = 1$ and, on each compact set $K \subseteq P$, the restriction $\xi_j|_K \equiv 0$ for all but finitely many $j \in \mathbb{N}$. We make the further assumption that the support of each of the functions ξ_j is contained in an open set $U_j \subseteq P$ that is diffeomorphic to a cube $(0,1)^n$, and we let $\phi_j : U_j \to (0,1)^n$ be the corresponding diffeomorphism.

We let $\tilde{\eta}_j$ be the distribution on $\mathbb{R}^n$ that results from pushing $\xi_j\eta$ forward to the cube $(0,1)^n$ and extending periodically. In other words, for all rapidly-decreasing (Schwartz) functions $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$, we let $\tau_z f(x) = f(x-z)$ and

$$\langle \tilde{\eta}_j, f\rangle = \sum_{z\in\mathbb{Z}^n} \langle \eta, \xi_j \cdot (\tau_z f)\circ\phi_j\rangle.$$

Like all periodic distributions, $\tilde{\eta}_j$ is a tempered distribution. We have

Lemma 7. *Every tempered distribution is a derivative of finite order of some continuous function of polynomial growth.*

For a proof, see for example [22, Theorem 3.8.1].

Let ζ_j be the continuous function of polynomial growth corresponding to $\tilde{\eta}_j$ (as furnished by Lemma 7) and let I_j be the multi-index corresponding to the derivative in the lemma, so that

$$\tilde{\eta}_j = \partial^{I_j}\zeta_j.$$

Let D_j be the (smooth) differential operator on P such that $\phi_j^*\partial^{I_j} = D_j\phi_j^*$, where ϕ_j^* denotes the pullback by ϕ_j. Observe that

$$\xi_j\eta = \phi_j^*\partial^{I_j}\zeta_j = D_j\phi_j^*\zeta_j.$$

Since ζ_j is a continuous function, $\phi_j^*\zeta_j$ is piecewise continuous, and hence it induces a measure on U_j. Then we can write

$$\eta = \sum_j \xi_j\eta = \sum_j D_j\phi_j^*\zeta_j,$$

and since each of the summands on the right can be expressed as a finite sum of derivatives of a continuous function, this proves the lemma. □

2.2 Variations

Let μ_s be a family of Borel measures on the manifold P parameterized by a real parameter s with values in an open interval $J \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ that contains 0. We say that the family μ_s is *differentiable* at $s = 0$ if there is a distribution $\eta \in \mathscr{D}'(P)$ such that, for every function $f \in C_c^\infty(P)$,

$$\left.\frac{d}{ds}\right|_{s=0} \int f \, d\mu_s = \langle \eta, f \rangle. \tag{3}$$

The distribution η is the *derivative* $d\mu_s/ds|_{s=0}$ of μ_s at $s = 0$.

If the limit (3) exists only when restricting to $s \geq 0$, we say that the family μ_s is *differentiable on one side*, and that the distribution η is the *one-sided derivative* of μ_s at $s = 0$.

We first consider the case of two-sided derivatives in Section 2.2.1, and then in Section 2.2.2 we explain what happens for the case of one-sided derivatives.

Remark 8. This is just one way to define differentiability of families of distributions; other ways have been explored for example in [42].

2.2.1 Two-sided derivatives

If we do not restrict to the case of positive measures, we get the following result.

Proposition 9. *For every Borel measure μ and every distribution η on P, there exists a family $(\mu_s)_s$ of signed Borel measures with*

$$\mu_0 = \mu \quad \textit{and} \quad \left.\frac{d\mu_s}{ds}\right|_{s=0} = \eta.$$

We prove this below. For the proof, we need to define a family of distributions $(\eta_s)_s$ to be *differentiable* if there is a distribution ν such that for every function $f \in C_c^\infty(P)$,

$$\left.\frac{d}{ds}\langle \eta_s, f \rangle\right|_{s=0} = \langle \nu, f \rangle.$$

Lemma 10. *For a generating tuple F of vector fields, a mollifier ψ, and any family of distributions $(\eta_s)_s$ differentiable at $s = 0$, we have*

$$\left.\frac{d}{ds}\right|_{s=0} \psi *_{s^2 F} \eta_s = \left.\frac{d\eta_s}{ds}\right|_{s=0}.$$

Proof. This follows from the fact that for $f \in C_c^\infty(P)$, $s \mapsto \psi *_{s^2F} f$ is an even function, so its derivative at $s = 0$ must vanish. □

Proof of Proposition 9. Take a mollifier ψ and a generating tuple F of vector fields. Then, as follows from Lemmas 5 and 10, the family $\mu_s = \psi *_{s^2F} (\mu_0 + s\eta)$ has the required properties. □

For families of *positive* measures, the situation is different.

Theorem 11. *Let μ be a positive Borel measure and let η be a distribution. Then there exists a family μ_s of positive measures with $\mu_0 = \mu$ and derivative $d\mu_s/ds|_{s=0} = \eta$ if, and only if, η satisfies the following condition:*

(Pos) $\langle \eta, f \rangle = 0$ *for every nonnegative $f \in \mathbb{C}_c^\infty(P)$ that vanishes indentically on* $\operatorname{supp} \mu$.

If μ is a probability measure and η additionally satisfies that $\langle \eta, 1 \rangle = 0$, then μ_s can be realized as a family of probability measures.

Remark 12. Condition (Pos) implies that $\operatorname{supp} \eta \subseteq \operatorname{supp} \mu$. Apart from this, Condition (Pos) is relevant only when $\operatorname{supp} \mu$ has parts that are very thin — only one point thick.

For example, if $P = \mathbb{R}$, and if μ is the Dirac delta δ_0, then Condition (Pos) implies that η must be of the form $A\delta_0 + B\partial\delta_0$, $A, B \in \mathbb{R}$. Indeed, take a cutoff function $\rho\colon \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R} \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ (i.e., $\rho \geq 0$, $\rho \equiv 1$ in a neighborhood of 0 and $\rho \equiv 0$ outside a slightly larger neighborhood). Then taking $f(x) = \rho(x) \sum_{i \geq 2} c_i x^i$ (with c_2 large enough to ensure that $f \geq 0$) we see that η must be of the proposed form in order to comply with Condition (Pos).

On the other hand, if we again had $P = \mathbb{R}$, but now $\mu = \chi_{[0,1]}$ the characteristic function on the unit interval, then as long as $\operatorname{supp} \eta \subseteq \operatorname{supp} \mu$, η can be any distribution and still comply with Condition (Pos).

Remark 13. The family μ_s can always be realized as a family of smooth measures (except maybe at $s = 0$). Indeed, if μ_s is any family of measures that is differentiable at $s = 0$, ψ is a mollifier, and F is a generating tuple, then the measure $\tilde{\mu}_s = \psi *_{s^2F} \mu_s$ has the same derivative at 0 and the same mass as μ_s, and $\tilde{\mu}_s$ is a positive measure if $\tilde{\mu}_s$ is. By Lemma 5, the measure $\tilde{\mu}_s$ is a smooth density for all $s \neq 0$.

Lemma 14. *Fix a point $p \in \operatorname{supp} \mu \subseteq P$. Let η_p be a distribution supported on p that satisfies Condition (Pos). Then there is a family of positive measures μ_s^p such that $\mu_0^p = \mu$ and*

$$\left.\frac{d\mu_s^p}{ds}\right|_{s=0} = \eta_p.$$

Moreover, the dependence of μ_s^p on p is measurable.

If μ is a probability measure and additionally $\langle \eta_p, 1\rangle = 0$, then μ_s^p can be realized as a family of probability measures.

For the proof of the lemma we will need a metric defined on the space of distributions involving up to k^{th} derivatives, $k \geq 1$, and given by

$$\operatorname{dist}_k(\theta_1, \theta_2) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^j \|f_j\|_k} \left|\langle \theta_1, f_j\rangle - \langle \theta_2, f_j\rangle\right| \tag{4}$$

for two distributions θ_1 and θ_2, and with $\{f_j\}_j \subset C_c^\infty(P)$ a sequence of functions that is dense with respect to the C^k norm

$$\|f\|_k = \sum_{|I|\leq k} \sup_{q\in P} |\partial^I f(q)|.$$

Proof of Lemma 14. Denote by $\mathscr{F}_\mu$ the space of nonnegative functions $f \in C_c^\infty(P)$ that vanish identically on $\operatorname{supp}\mu$. Let $V \subseteq T_pP$ be the subspace that is null for the Hessians at p of all the functions in $\mathscr{F}_\mu$:

$$V = \{v \in T_pP : \operatorname{Hess}_p f(v,v) = 0 \text{ for all } f \in \mathscr{F}_\mu\}.$$

Let $m = \dim V \leq n = \dim P$. Take coordinates $(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n)$ around p such that the vectors

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1}, \ldots, \frac{\partial}{\partial x_m} \in T_pP$$

form a basis of V and $\partial/\partial x_1, \ldots, \partial/\partial x_n$ is an orthonormal basis of T_pP. Then by Lemma 6 we know that η must be a finite linear combination of distributions of the form

$$\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_u}\right)^{e_0} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1}\right)^{e_1} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_2}\right)^{e_2} \cdots \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_m}\right)^{e_m} \delta_p$$

where $e_0 \in \{0,1\}$, $u > m$, and the integers $e_1, \ldots, e_m$ are nonnegative. For reasons analogous to those explained in Remark 12, Condition (Pos) makes it impossible to have higher derivatives in the directions outside V (i.e., in the direction of x_u in this expression).

Let us show that it is enough to prove the lemma for the case in which $e_0 = 0$. Indeed, if ν_s is a family of positive measures such that $\nu_0 = \mu$ and

$$\left.\frac{d\nu_s}{ds}\right|_{s=0} = \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1}\right)^{e_1} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_2}\right)^{e_2} \cdots \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_m}\right)^{e_m} \delta_p, \tag{5}$$

and if ϕ is the flow of the vector field $\partial/\partial x_u$, then

$$\frac{d}{ds}\phi_s^*\nu_s\bigg|_{s=0} = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_u}\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1}\right)^{e_1}\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_2}\right)^{e_2}\cdots\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_m}\right)^{e_m}\delta_p.$$

So we will assume that $e_0 = 0$ and we will focus on finding such a family ν_s. In particular, we will assume that η_p is of the form given in the right-hand-side of equation (5). In other words, we will assume that it only involves derivatives in the directions of V.

Lemma 15. *Let ψ be a mollifier and F a generating tuple of vector fields. For η_p as in the right-hand-side of equation (5) and for $k = \sum_{i=1}^m e_i$, we have, for all $t > 0$,*

$$\inf_g \operatorname{dist}_k(g \cdot (\psi *_{tF} \mu), \eta_p) = 0,$$

where the infimum is taken over all measurable functions $g\colon P \to \mathbb{R}$, and dist_k is the distance defined in (4).

The reader will find the proof of Lemma 15 below.

With ψ and F as in the lemma, let

$$r_{i,m} = \sum_{j=i}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^{jm}} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mu_i = \psi *_{r_{i,2}^2 F} \mu$$

for $i \in \mathbb{N}$. In particular $r_{i,1} \to 0, r_{i,2} \to 0$, and $\mu_i \to \mu$ as $i \to +\infty$. Let k be as in Lemma 15, and denote by $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ de essential supremum norm. For each $j \in \mathbb{N}$, take a measurable function g_j such that $\|g_j\|_\infty \leq 1$ and

$$\operatorname{dist}_k(2^j g_j \mu_j, \eta_p) < \frac{1}{2^j} + \inf_{\|g\|_\infty \leq 1} \operatorname{dist}_k(2^j g \mu_j, \eta_p),$$

where the infimum is taken over all measurable functions $g : P \to \mathbb{R}$ with essential supremum ≤ 1. With this definition, Lemma 15 implies that if we let $j \to +\infty$, we get $2^j g_j \mu_j \to \eta_p$.

We let, for $r_{i+1,2} \leq |s| < r_{i,2}$,

$$\nu_s = (1 - 2^{1-i})\mu_i + \sum_{j=i}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^j}(1 + g_j \operatorname{sgn} s)\mu_j.$$

By construction, ν_s is a family of positive measures such that $\nu_s \to \mu$ as $s \to 0$ and its derivative at $s = 0$ is η_p. To see why, first note that, as $s \to 0$, we have $i \to +\infty$,

$$(1 - 2^{1-i})\mu_i + \sum_{j=i}^{\infty} \frac{\mu_j}{2^j} \to \mu,$$

and the derivative of that term at $s = 0$ vanishes by Lemma 10. The other term vanishes as $s \to 0$, and its derivative is the limit, as $s \to 0$, of

$$\frac{1}{s}\sum_{j=i}^{\infty}\frac{\operatorname{sgn} s}{2^j}g_j\mu_j \approx \frac{1}{r_{i,2}}\sum_{j=i}^{\infty}\frac{1}{2^j}g_j\mu_j \underset{\text{L'Hôpital}}{\to} \frac{2^{-i}g_i\mu_i}{2^{-2i}} \to \eta_p,$$

where we applied L'Hôpital's rule because both the sum and $r_{i,2}$ tend to 0 as $s \to 0$ (or $i \to +\infty$).

To ensure the measurability of the p-dependence of this construction, we further specify the construction as follows. For each $j \in \mathbb{Z}_-$, we take a covering of P by measurable sets A_j of diameter at most $-1/j$. For all $p \in A_i$, we take the same function g_j. This ensures that these choices are made in a 'measurable' way. The rest of the construction does not depend on arbitrary choices, so the dependence becomes measurable.

The last statement of the lemma follows from the fact that if η_p satisfies $\langle \eta_p, 1\rangle = 0$, then either g_j can be chosen so that $g_j\mu_j$ satisfies this too, or else $e_1 = e_2 = \cdots = e_n = 0$, and in both cases the coordinates can be picked so that the mass is preserved by the flow ϕ_s for small-enough $|s|$. □

Proof of Lemma 15. This is a local problem and by pushing forward with a chart, we may assume that P is some Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^n$. Let $\bar{\mu} = \psi *_{tF} \mu$. Note that $\operatorname{supp}\bar{\mu}$ has nonempty interior, and in fact contains a neighborhood of p.

For each $j = 1, 2, \ldots$, let $\{x_i^j\}_{i=1}^{\infty} \subseteq \operatorname{supp}\bar{\mu} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a sequence of points contained within distance $1/j$ of p. We also assume that their Zariski closure is all of $\mathbb{R}^n$ (i.e., that no nonzero polynomial vanishes on all of them simultaneously). For a large-enough finite subset I_j of $\mathbb{N}$, there is always a solution to the problem of finding real numbers c_{ij} such that

$$\langle \eta_p, f\rangle = \lim_{h\to 0}\frac{1}{h^k}\sum_{i\in I_j} c_{ij} f(hx_i^j) \tag{6}$$

for all $f \in C_c^\infty(P)$. To see this, note that expanding the right-hand-side as Taylor series in h and comparing coefficients, one obtains a linear system in the variables c_{ij}, and that this system has solutions if sufficiently many points x_i^j are available and if they are in a sufficiently-general position (which we may assume to be true since their Zariski closure can be made as large as necessary). Equivalently, we have a measure that approximates η_p:

$$h^{-k}\sum_{i\in I_j} c_{ij}\delta_{x_i^j} \to \eta_p \quad \text{as} \quad h \to 0.$$

These measures also tend to η_p as $j \to \infty$.

We now approximate those measures with measurable functions. For each $j = 1, 2, \ldots$, let $0 < \varepsilon_j < j^{-2}$ be small enough that the balls $B_{\varepsilon_j}(x_i^j)$ are disjoint. For $q \in B_{\varepsilon_j}(x_i^j) \cap \operatorname{supp} \bar{\mu}$ for some $i \in I_j$, let

$$g_j(q) = \frac{c_{ij}}{\bar{\mu}(B_{\varepsilon_j}(x_i^j))},$$

and let $g_j(q) = 0$ for all other $q \in P$. Then $g_j \bar{\mu} \to \eta_p$, and this proves the lemma. □

Proof of Theorem 11. Assume first that the family μ_s exists. To prove that Condition (Pos) must hold, let $f \in \mathscr{F}_\mu$ (as defined in the proof to Lemma 14), and consider the function

$$g(s) = \int f \, d\mu_s.$$

Since f is nonnegative and μ_s is a positive measure for all s, g must be nonnegative as well. Since $g(0) = 0$, it must also be true that $g'(0) = 0$, and this is equivalent to Condition (Pos).

Now assume that we have a measure μ and a distribution η such that Condition (Pos) holds, and let us construct a family μ_s as in the statement of the theorem. Write $\eta = \sum_I \partial^I \nu_I$ as in Lemma 6 where the ν_I are signed measures for each multi-index I, and the sum is locally finite. For all I with $|I| > 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \partial^I \nu_I, f \rangle = (-1)^{|I|} \int \partial^I f \, d\nu_I = (-1)^{|I|} \int \int \partial^I f \, d\delta_p \, d\nu_I(p) \\ = \int \langle \partial^I \delta_p, f \rangle \, d\nu_I(p).\end{aligned}$$

We take

$$\eta_{p,I} = \partial^I \delta_p.$$

For ν_I-almost all p, the distributions $\eta_{p,I}$ also satisfy Condition (Pos). From Lemma 14, we get families $\mu_s^{p,I}$ of measures whose derivatives at 0 are precisely the distributions $\eta_{p,I}$. Thus by linearity of the derivative,

$$\mu_s = \mu + s\nu_\varnothing + \sum_{|I|>0} \int \mu_s^{p,I} d\nu_I(p)$$

is a family as in the statement of the theorem in an neighborhood of $s = 0$, and can be easily modified to satisfy it for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$.

If μ is a probability, since each $\mu_s^{p,I}$ preserves the probability for $|I| > 0$ and since $\langle \eta, 1 \rangle = 0$ implies that $\nu_\varnothing(P) = 0$, we conclude that μ_s also preserves the probability. □

2.2.2 One-sided derivatives

Since one-sided differentiability is a less restrictive condition than two-sided differentiability, if we allow signed measures we will again get that all distributions arise as derivatives of such families. Thus Proposition 9 holds word-for-word for one-sided derivatives too.

In the case of positive measures, a small modification to Theorem 11 is necessary:

Theorem 16. *Let μ be a positive Borel measure and let η be a distribution. Then there exists a family μ_s, $s \geq 0$, of positive measures $\mu_0 = \mu$ and one-sided derivative $\eta = d\mu_s/ds|_{s=0+}$ if, and only if, η satisfies the following condition:*

(Pos$^+$) *$\langle \eta, f \rangle \geq 0$ for every nonnegative $f \in C_c^\infty(P)$ that vanishes identically on* $\operatorname{supp}(\mu)$.

If μ is a probability measure and η additionally satisfies that $\langle \eta, 1 \rangle = 0$, then μ_s can be realized as a family of probability measures.

Sketch of proof. Any distribution η that satisfies Condition (Pos$^+$) can be written as

$$\eta = \eta^0 + \kappa,$$

where η^0 satisfies (Pos) and κ is a positive Borel measure on P (with no restrictions on $\operatorname{supp}\kappa$). A family $(\mu_s)_s$ can thus be produced using the techniques used to prove Theorem 11. □

2.3 Flows

In this section we aim to give a rough scheme of how one can find an object closely related to the Colombeau algebra that gives a sense of "direction of the movement" for many distributions, in direct connection with mass transport theory.

For simplicity, let $P = \mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geq 1$. When μ_t is a family of densities that defines an absolutely continuous curve in Wasserstein space, it has been shown (see for example [4, Chapter 8]) that the derivatives of μ can be

interpreted as the divergence of a vector field, that is, there are vector fields v_t on $\mathbb{R}^n$ satisfying the continuity equation,

$$\frac{d\mu_t}{dt} + \operatorname{div}(\mu_t v_t) = 0, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{7}$$

The interpretation is that the mass of μ_t is being transported by the flow of the vector field v_t. This gives a way to assign a vector field v_t to the distribution $d\mu_t/dt$, and this vector field gives a notion of "direction of the movement." The vector field v_t is not unique; it is ambiguous by a vector field u_t such that $\operatorname{div}(\mu_t u_t) = 0$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Since for norm-induced topologies on the space of vector fields the set of possibilities is closed, one can choose a norm and choose the v_t to be the minimizer for each t. One can show that the minimizer is in fact a gradient vector field, $v_t = \nabla\phi_t$ for some functions $\phi_t \colon \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$.

On the other hand, the results of Section 2.2 indicate that in the case of more general curves that are not absolutely continuous with respect to the Wasserstein metric (but are differentiable in the sense considered in Section 2.2), much more general distributions can arise as the derivative. Thus, we can see an arbitrary distribution η as the derivative of a family of measures at some point, say, $d\mu_t/dt|_{t=0} = \eta$, and we can use the continuity equation (7) to try to assign an object that will give an idea of direction of the movement determined by η.

This can be done using Colombeau algebras. These algebras were developed [7] to provide a context in which distributions can be multiplied. All distributions are contained in these algebras. Roughly speaking, the solution to the multiplication problem is to record, instead of the distribution itself, all possible smoothings of the distribution. An equivalence relation is then proposed on a certain set of families of smooth functions, and its equivalence classes are the elements of the algebra.

To define the relevant Colombeau algebra, we follow [8, Section 8.5]. Let $\mathcal{E}(P)$ be the set of families $(f_\varepsilon)_{0<\varepsilon<1}$ of functions $f_\varepsilon \in C^\infty(P)$ indexed by $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, such that for each compact set $K \subset P$ and every multi-index I there are $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $\eta > 0$, and $c > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{x\in K} \left|\partial^I f_\varepsilon(x)\right| \leq \frac{c}{\varepsilon^N} \quad \text{if } 0 < \varepsilon < \eta.$$

We define the ideal $\mathcal{N}(P)$ of $\mathcal{E}(P)$ to be the set of families $(f_\varepsilon)_{0<\varepsilon<1}$ such that for all compact sets K, for all multi-indices I, and for all $q \in \mathbb{N}$ there exist $c > 0$ and $\eta > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{x\in K} \left|\partial^I f_\varepsilon(x)\right| \leq c\varepsilon^q \quad \text{if } 0 < \varepsilon < \eta.$$

This means that the objects in $\mathcal{N}(P)$ have a fast decay (faster than any power of ε) when $\varepsilon \to 0$. The *Colombeau algebra* is the quotient

$$\mathcal{G}(P) = \mathcal{E}(P)/\mathcal{N}(P).$$

All distributions η are contained in $\mathcal{G}(P)$ because the families $(\psi *_{\varepsilon F} \eta)_\varepsilon$ of smoothings are contained there. We denote by $[\eta]$ the set of elements of $\mathcal{G}(P)$ that would be associated to the distribution η; that is, $(f_\varepsilon)_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{G}(P)$ belongs to $[\eta]$ if for all $\phi \in C_c^\infty(P)$

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0+} \int \phi(x)\, f_\varepsilon(x)\, dx - \langle \eta, \phi \rangle = 0.$$

Let μ be a Borel measure on P and let η be a distribution satisfying (Pos), so that the conclusions of Theorem 11 hold. Let $\mathcal{M}(\mu)$ be the set families of smooth vector fields $(v_\varepsilon)_{0<\varepsilon<1}$, such that for all $(\mu^\varepsilon)_\varepsilon \in [\mu]$ satisfying $\int \mu^\varepsilon(x)\, dx = 1$ and $\mu^\varepsilon(x) \geq 0$ for $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, we have

$$(\operatorname{div}(\mu^\varepsilon v_\varepsilon))_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{G}(P).$$

The space $\mathcal{M}(\mu)$ is clearly a vector space, and it always contains a solution to the system of equations

$$\eta^\varepsilon + \operatorname{div}(\mu^\varepsilon v_\varepsilon) = 0$$

where $(\eta^\varepsilon)_\varepsilon \in [\eta]$ is such that for all $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ we have $\operatorname{supp} \eta^\varepsilon \subseteq \operatorname{supp} \mu^\varepsilon$ (such $(\eta^\varepsilon)_\varepsilon$ always exists because η satisfies (Pos)) because this is just the classical case of equation (7).

The (non-unique) family $(v_\varepsilon)_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{M}(\mu)$ is the object we have been pursuing, as it gives precise meaning to the notion of "direction of movement" associated to η with respect to μ. It would be interesting to know which parts of the theory of mass transport still hold in this context. In particular, it is not clear whether the hypothetical object "$\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} v_\varepsilon$" itself corresponds to a distribution on TP in some cases.

3 Preliminaries on holonomic measures

3.1 Setting

Phase space. Let M be a compact, oriented C^∞ manifold of dimension $d \geq 1$, without boundary $\partial M = \varnothing$. Denote by TM its tangent bundle and, for $n \geq 1$, denote by $T^n M$ the direct sum bundle

$$T^n M = \underbrace{TM \oplus \cdots \oplus TM}_{n}$$

of n copies of TM. The dimension of T^nM is $d(n+1)$. An element in T^nM can be denoted $(x, v_1, v_2 \ldots, v_n)$, where x is a point in M and $v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n \in T_xM$ are vectors tangent to x. When taking local coordinates, we will write

$$x = (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_d) \quad \text{and} \quad v_i = (v_{i1}, v_{i2}, \ldots, v_{id}).$$

Sometimes for brevity we will write (x, v) instead of $(x, v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n)$.

The projection $\pi : T^nM \to M$ is given by $\pi(x, v_1, \ldots, v_n) = x$. We denote by $\Omega^n(M)$ the space of smooth differential n-forms on M. We will often consider these forms as smooth functions on T^nM.

Throughout, when referring to functions on these objects, we will use the term *smooth* to mean C^∞. We will denote by $C^\infty(X, Y)$ the space of all smooth functions $X \to Y$. If Y is the real line $\mathbb{R}$, we will sometimes omit it in our notation. We will denote by $C_c^\infty(X)$ the set of all real-valued, compactly-supported, smooth functions on the set X.

Riemannian structure. We fix, once and for all, a Riemannian metric $g \in C^\infty(T^2M)$ on M and its corresponding Levi-Civita connection ∇. We denote the operation of covariant differentiation in the direction of a vector field F by ∇_F.

We will denote $|v| = \sqrt{g(v, v)}$ for $v \in T_xM$, and we extend this norm to T_x^nM by letting

$$|(v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n)| = \sqrt{|v_1|^2 + |v_2|^2 + \cdots + |v_n|^2}.$$

Forms. We will denote by $\Omega^k(M)$ the space of smooth differential k-forms on M. On this space we define a norm $\|\cdot\|$ by letting, for $\omega \in \Omega^k(M)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\omega\| &= \sup\{\omega_x(v_1, \ldots, v_k) : (x, v_1, \ldots, v_k) \in T^nM, |v_i| \le 1\} \\ &= \left|\det(g(v_i, v_j)_{i,j=1}^n\right| \end{aligned}$$

3.2 Definition of holonomic measures and their topology

For $x \in M$, define the volume function $\mathrm{vol}_n : T_x^nM \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\mathrm{vol}_n(v_1, \ldots, v_n) = \sup_{\omega \in \Omega^n(M), \|\omega\| \le 1} \omega_x(v_1, \ldots, v_n).$$

We let $\mathscr{V}_n$ be the space of *subvolume functions*, that is, the space of real-valued continuous functions $f \in C^0(T^nM)$ such that

$$\sup_{(x, v_1, \ldots, v_n) \in T^nM} \frac{|f(x, v_1, \ldots, v_n)|}{1 + \mathrm{vol}_n(v_1, \ldots, v_n)} < +\infty.$$

Note that all differential n-forms on M belong to $\mathscr{V}_n$ when regarded as functions on T^nM. We endow $\mathscr{V}_n$ with the supremum norm and its induced topology.

Mild measures. We define the *mass* $\mathbf{M}(\mu)$ of $\mu \in \mathscr{M}_n$ to be

$$\mathbf{M}(\mu) = \int_{T^nM} \mathrm{vol}_n(v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n)\, d\mu(x, v_1, \ldots, v_n).$$

This is always a nonnegative number. A positive Borel measure μ on T^nM is *mild* if $\mathbf{M}(\mu) < +\infty$. Denote by $\mathscr{M}_n$ the space of mild measures.

The space $\mathscr{M}_n$ is natually embedded in the dual space $\mathscr{V}_n{}^*$ and we endow it with the topology induced by the weak* topology on $\mathscr{V}_n{}^*$. Although the topology on $\mathscr{V}_n{}^*$ is not metrizable, the topology on $\mathscr{M}_n$ is. We can give a metric in $\mathscr{M}_n$ by picking a sequence of functions $\{f_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \subset C_c^\infty(T^nM)$ that are dense in $\mathscr{V}_n$, and then letting

$$\mathrm{dist}_{\mathscr{M}_n}(\mu_1, \mu_2) = |\mathbf{M}(\mu_1) - \mathbf{M}(\mu_2)| + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^k \sup |f_k|} \left| \int |f_k| d\mu_1 - \int |f_k| d\mu_2 \right|. \tag{8}$$

Holonomic measures. A mild measure $\mu \in \mathscr{M}_n$ is *holonomic* if it is a probability (that is, a positive measure such that $\mu(T^nM) = 1$), and if for every differential $(n-1)$-form $\omega \in \Omega^{n-1}(M)$,

$$\int_{T^nM} d\omega\, d\mu = 0. \tag{9}$$

The space $\mathscr{H}$ of holonomic measures is convex.

The motivation for this definition is given by Proposition 18 below.

Remark 17. A mild measure μ induces a current $T\colon \Omega^n(M) \to \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$\langle T, \omega \rangle = \int \omega\, d\mu.$$

Motivated by Stokes's theorem, the boundary ∂T of this current is defined by duality as

$$\langle \partial T, \omega \rangle = \langle T, d\omega \rangle.$$

The definition of holonomic measures equivalent to requiring the boundary ∂T of the induced current to be empty.

Cellular complexes. An *n-dimensional cell* (or *n-cell*) γ is a smooth map

$$\gamma : D \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \to M,$$

where D is a subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ homeomorphic to a closed ball, *together* with a choice of coordinates $t = (t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_n)$ on D. A *chain* of n-cells is a formal linear combination of the form

$$a_1\gamma_1 + a_2\gamma_2 + \cdots + a_k\gamma_k$$

for real numbers $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_k$ and n-cells $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \ldots, \gamma_k$. We will say that a chain is *positive* if $a_i > 0$.

Let $\gamma : D \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \to M$ be an n-cell. Denote by $d\gamma$ the differential map associating, to each element in D, an element in T^nM. Explicitly, if we have coordinates $t = (t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_n)$ on D, then

$$d\gamma(t) = \left(\gamma(t), \frac{\partial\gamma}{\partial t_1}(t), \frac{\partial\gamma}{\partial t_2}(t), \cdots, \frac{\partial\gamma}{\partial t_n}(t)\right).$$

This map *does* depend on our choice of coordinates t.

To an n-cell γ, we associate a measure μ_γ on T^nM defined by

$$\int_{T^nM} f\, d\mu_\gamma = \int_D f(d\gamma(t))\, dt,$$

where $dt = dt_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dt_n$. In other words, μ_γ is the pushforward of Lebesgue measure on D, $\mu_\gamma = d\gamma_* dt$.

Similarly, to a chain of n-cells $\alpha = \sum_{i=1}^k a_i\gamma_i$, we associate the measure μ_α given by

$$\mu_\alpha = \sum_{i=1}^k a_i \mu_{\gamma_i}.$$

The measure μ_α is an element of $\mathscr{M}_n$. We will say that the chain α is a *cycle* if for all forms $\omega \in \Omega^{n-1}(M)$,

$$\int_{T^nM} d\omega\, d\mu_\alpha = 0.$$

That is to say, that the chain α is a cycle if μ_α is holonomic.

Proposition 18. *Assume that $1 \leq n \leq d$. Let $\mu \in \mathscr{M}_n$ be a probability measure on T^nM. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

1. *The measure μ is holonomic.*

2. *There exists a sequence* $\{\alpha_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ *of cycles such that the induced measures* μ_{α_k} *are all probabilites on* T^nM*, and* $\mu_{\alpha_k} \to \mu$ *as* $k \to \infty$ *in the topology induced by the distance* (8). □

This was proved in [40]. Thus the space of holonomic measures is precisely the closure of the space of measures μ_α induced by cycles α.

4 The holonomic tangent space

4.1 Mild distributions

A *partition of unity* in T^nM is a set of nonnegative functions $\{\psi_i\}_i \subset C_c^\infty(T^nM)$ such that for all $x \in T^nM$

$$\sum_i \psi_i(x) = 1.$$

Recall that distributions on manifolds were discussed in Section 2.1. Given a distribution $\eta \in \mathscr{D}'(T^nM)$, we want to make sense of its value at a form $\omega \in \Omega^n(M)$. We let

$$\langle \eta, \omega \rangle = \sum_i \langle \eta, \psi_i \omega \rangle,$$

We denote by $\mathscr{D}'_n \subset \mathscr{D}'(T^nM)$ the set of *mild distributions*, namely, the set of those distributions for which the series in the right-hand-side converges absolutely for all $\omega \in \Omega^n(M)$. This is independent of our choice of partition of unity $\{\psi_i\}_i$. Also, the spaces of mild measures $\mathscr{M}_n$ and of holonomic measures $\mathscr{H}$ are subsets of $\mathscr{D}'_n$.

A family of measures $\mu_t \in \mathscr{M}_n$ is *differentiable* at 0 if there is a distribution $\eta \in \mathscr{D}'_n$ such that for all $f \in C_c^\infty(T^nM)$

$$\left.\frac{d}{dt}\right|_{t=0} \int f \, d\mu_t = \langle \eta, f \rangle.$$

4.2 Two-sided variations of holonomic measures

Theorem 19. *Let* μ *be a holonomic measure in* T^nM *and let* $\eta \in \mathscr{D}'_n$ *be a mild distribution on* T^nM*. Then there exists a family of holonomic measures* $(\mu_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}} \subset \mathscr{M}_n$ *such that* $\mu_0 = \mu$ *and*

$$\left.\frac{d}{dt}\right|_{t=0} \int f \, d\mu_t = \langle \eta, f \rangle \tag{10}$$

for all $f \in C_c^\infty(T^nM)$ *if, and only if, the following conditions are satisfied:*

(Pos) *For all nonnegative* $f \in C_c^\infty(T^nM)$ *that vanish on* $\operatorname{supp}\mu$, $\langle \eta, f\rangle = 0$.

(Hol) *For all differential forms* $\omega \in \Omega^{n-1}(M)$, $\langle \eta, d\omega\rangle = 0$.

(Prob) $\langle \eta, 1\rangle = 0$.

Remark 20. In other words, the tangent space to the space of holonomic measures at the point μ is characterized by Conditions (Pos), (Hol), and (Prob). In fact, we have the following easy

Lemma 21. *If* $\langle \eta, f\rangle$ *consists of an integral of* $f \in C_c^\infty(T^nM)$ *and of an integral of first derivatives of* f *(i.e., if* η *extends to a functional on* $C_c^1(T^nM)$*), and if* $\operatorname{supp}\eta \subseteq \operatorname{supp}\mu$, *then* η *satisfies condition* (Pos). □

Proof of Theorem 19. By Theorem 11, Condition (Pos) is necessary. If $(\mu_t)_t$ exists, then we have

$$0 = \frac{d}{dt}\bigg|_{t=0} \int d\omega \, d\mu_t = \langle \eta, d\omega\rangle$$

for all $\omega \in \Omega^{n-1}(M)$. Hence, Condition (Hol) is also necessary. Condition (Prob) is necessary because we want $\mu_t(T^nM) = 1$ for all t.

To prove that Conditions (Pos), (Hol), and (Prob) are sufficient, assume that they are satisfied. Then by Theorem 11 we have a family of probability measures θ_t for t in some interval that contains 0, with $\theta_0 = \mu$ and with (10). Moreover, the proofs of Theorem 11 and Lemma 14 show that θ_t can be assumed to be in $\mathscr{M}_n$ for all t. Now we need to modify θ_t so that it is also a family of holonomic measures.

There exists a family of positive measures ν_t such that for all $\omega \in \Omega^{n-1}(M)$ and all t

$$\int d\omega \, d\theta_t + \int d\omega \, d\nu_t = 0.$$

The measure ν_t can for example be obtained from θ_t as follows. For each $x \in M$, let $r_x : T_x^nM \to T_x^nM$ be some reflection such that the multivector $r_x(v)$ has the opposite orientation as the multivector $v \in T^nM$. These reflections can be chosen in a piecewise-continuous (and hence measurable) way with respect to the variable x. Then one can take the family of measures determined by $\nu_t|_{T_x^nM} = r_x^*(\theta_t|_{T_x^nM})$.

We may assume that $\nu_t(T^nM \cap \{0\}) = 0$ because the part of ν_t on the zero section does not contribute to the integrals

$$\int d\omega \, d\nu_t, \quad \omega \in \Omega^{n-1}(M).$$

For $a > 0$, let $\lambda_a : T^nM \to T^nM$ be the map given by

$$\lambda_a(x, v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n) = (x, av_1, av_2, av_3, \dots, av_n).$$

The measure $\nu_t^a = \lambda_a^* \nu_t / a^n$ satisfies

$$\int d\omega \, d\nu_t^a = \frac{1}{a^n} \int d\omega(x, av_1, \dots, av_n) \, d\nu_t = \int d\omega \, d\nu_t$$

for all $\omega \in \Omega^{n-1}(M)$. As $a \to \infty$, the mass $\int d\nu_t^a$ of ν_t^a tends to 0. It is hence possible to find a function $b : \mathbb{R} - \{0\} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ such that $\nu_t^{b(t)}$ is a family of measures with

$$\left. \frac{d\nu_t^{b(t)}}{dt} \right|_{t=0} = 0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad \lim_{t \to 0} \frac{1}{t^2} \int d\nu_t^{b(t)} = 0.$$

We let

$$\mu_t = \frac{\theta_t + \nu_t^{b(t)}}{1 + \int d\nu_t^{b(t)}}$$

for $t \neq 0$ and $\mu_0 = \mu$. This is a family of measures as in the statement of the theorem. □

4.3 One-sided variations of holonomic measures

We state the analogue of Theorem 19 for one-sided derivatives, which follows from 16 in a similar way as Theorem 19 follows from Theorem 11.

Theorem 22. *Let μ be a holonomic measure in T^nM and let $\eta \in \mathscr{D}'_n$ be a distribution on T^nM. Then there exists a family of holonomic measures $\mu_t \in \mathscr{M}_n$, $t \geq 0$, such that $\mu_0 = \mu$ and*

$$\left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0+} \int f \, d\mu_t = \langle \eta, f \rangle \tag{11}$$

for all $f \in C_c^\infty(T^nM)$ if, and only if, the following conditions are satisfied:

(Pos$^+$) *For all nonnegative $f \in C_c^\infty(T^nM)$ that vanish on $\operatorname{supp}\mu$, $\langle \eta, f \rangle \geq 0$.*

(Hol) *For all differential forms $\omega \in \Omega^{n-1}(M)$, $\langle \eta, d\omega \rangle = 0$.*

(Prob) $\langle \eta, 1 \rangle = 0$.

Analogously to Lemma 21, we have

Lemma 23. *If the distribution η extends to a functional on $C_c^1(\operatorname{supp}\mu) \cap C_c^0(T^nM)$ (i.e., if η only involves an integral of the test function on T^nM and an integral of its first derivatives on $\operatorname{supp}\mu$), then η satisfies condition* (Pos$^+$).

5 Examples

5.1 Criticality

Results in this section are valid for measures that are critical with respect to the action of a general smooth Lagrangian $L \in C^\infty(T^n M)$. Unless explicitly stated, we do not require, for example, that L be convex.

A *variation* of a holonomic measure $\mu \in \mathscr{H}$ is a family μ_t of holonomic measures that is defined for $t \geq 0$, is differentiable at 0, and satisfies $\mu_0 = \mu$.

We denote by A_L the action of the Lagrangian L,

$$A_L(\mu) = \int_{T^n M} L \, d\mu.$$

We say that $\mu \in \mathscr{H}$ is *critical* for A_L if for every variation μ_t with $\mu_0 = \mu$ the one-sided derivative satisfies

$$\left.\frac{d}{dt}\right|_{t=0^+} A_L(\mu_t) \geq 0. \tag{12}$$

By Theorem 22, μ is critical if, and only if, for all distributions $\eta \in \mathscr{D}'_n$ that satisfies Conditions (Pos$^+$), (Hol), and (Prob), we have

(Crit) $\langle \eta, L \rangle \geq 0$.

Remark 24. Note that if η satisfies not only (Pos$^+$), (Hol), and (Prob), but also (Pos)(i.e., if it appears as a two-sided derivative), then (Crit) is equivalent to $\langle \eta, L \rangle = 0$.

Homology. A holonomic measure $\mu \in \mathscr{H}$ is assigned its *homology class* $\rho(\mu) \in H_n(M; \mathbb{R})$ by requiring

$$\langle \rho(\mu), \omega \rangle = \int \omega \, d\mu$$

for all closed forms $\omega \in \Omega^n(M)$, $d\omega = 0$. If for each t the measure μ_t has the same associated homology class as μ_0, $\rho(\mu_t) = \rho(\mu_0)$, then we say that the variation μ_t is *homology preserving*. Clearly, for this to happen the following condition is necessary on the one-sided derivative $\eta = d\mu_t/dt|_{t=0^+}$:

(Hom) $\langle \eta, \omega \rangle = 0$ for all $\omega \in \Omega^n(M)$ with $d\omega = 0$.

Conjecture 25. Conditions (Pos$^+$), (Hol), (Prob), and (Hom) are sufficient for the existence of a homology preserving variation μ_t. □

We will say that $\mu \in \mathscr{H}$ is *critical for A_L within its homology class* if equation (12) holds for every homology preserving variation μ_t of μ. In particular, if μ is critical for A_L, then it is also critical within its homology class.

5.2 Horizontal variations

Let $X\colon M \to TM$ be a smooth vector field on M. For $f \in C_c^\infty(T^nM)$, denote by Xf the Lie derivative in the (horizontal) direction X. This is given by $Xf = d_x f(X)$, and is independent of the Riemannian metric on M. For a differential form $\omega \in \Omega^n(M)$, the action of X on ω is also defined, and it is equal to the Lie derivative $\mathcal{L}_X\omega = i_X d\omega + d i_X \omega$. Here, i_X denotes the contraction.

Let μ be a holonomic measure on T^nM. The distribution η given by

$$\langle \eta, f\rangle = \int_{T^nM} Xf \, d\mu \tag{13}$$

for $f \in C_c^\infty(T^nM)$ clearly satisfies Conditions (Pos) and (Prob). It also satisfies Condition (Hol) because for all $\omega \in \Omega^{n-1}(M)$,

$$\langle \eta, d\omega\rangle = \int \mathcal{L}_X d\omega \, d\mu = \int i_X d^2\omega + d i_X d\omega \, d\mu = 0.$$

Therefore, η is in the tangent space to μ.

It also satisfies Condition (Hom) because, if ω is a closed n-form,

$$\frac{d}{ds}\int \omega \, d\mu_s = \int \mathcal{L}_X\omega \, d\mu_s = \int i_X d\omega + d i_X \omega \, d\mu_s = 0.$$

The last equality is true since $d\omega = 0$ because ω is closed, and $\int d i_X\omega \, d\mu_s = 0$ because μ_s is holonomic.

In fact, it is easy to explicitly construct a family μ_t with derivative η and $\mu_0 = \mu$. To do this, take the flow $\phi_t : \mathbb{R}\times M \to M$ of X on M, determined by

$$\phi_0(x) = x, \quad \frac{d}{dt}\phi_t(x) = X(x), \quad \text{for } x \in M, t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Extend this to an isotopy $r : \mathbb{R}\times T^nM \to T^nM$ by

$$r_t(x, v_1, \ldots, v_n) = (\phi_t(x), d\phi_t(v_1), \ldots, d\phi_t(v_n)),$$

where $d\phi_t : T_xM \to T_{\phi_t(x)}M$ denotes the derivative of ϕ_t at x. Then we can simply let $\mu_t = r_t^*\mu$. From this construction and Proposition 18, it is clear that μ_t is homology preserving. We thus have

Proposition 26. *If μ is critical for A_L within its homology class, then Condition (Crit) must hold for all distributions η of the form given in equation* (13). □

Euler-Lagrange equations. Assume that the holonomic measure μ is induced by a piecewise smooth cycle α, that is,

$$\mu = \mu_\alpha.$$

We will now recover the traditional Euler-Lagrange equations in this special case.

For $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $r_t \circ \alpha$ denote the cycle that results from the operation of composing each of the n-cells γ_i that appear in α with the isotopy r:

$$\text{if } \alpha = \sum_i c_i \gamma_i,\ c_i \in \mathbb{R}, \text{ then } r_t \circ \alpha = \sum_i c_i\, r_t \circ \gamma_i.$$

The variation $\mu_t = r_t^* \mu_\alpha$ constructed above is precisely the same as $\mu_{r_t \circ \alpha}$.

We want to examine what happens when the measure μ is critical for A_L with respect to all such variations μ_t for all vector fields X. We will assume that the support of the derivative of the variation $d\mu_s/ds|_{s=0}$ is contained within a chart, and we will work in local coordinates. We will write $dt = dt_1 \cdots dt_n$. We denote the partial derivatives of L by L_x and L_{v_i}. For each such variation we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
0 = \left.\frac{d}{ds}\right|_{s=0} \int L\, d\mu_s &= \left.\frac{d}{ds}\right|_{s=0} \sum_i c_i \int L(d(r_s \circ \gamma_i))\, dt \\
&= \sum_i c_i \int \left[L_x(d\gamma_i)\, \left.\frac{\partial r_s \circ \gamma_i}{\partial s}\right|_{s=0} + \sum_j L_{v_j}(d\gamma_i)\, \left.\frac{\partial^2 (r_s \circ \gamma_i)}{\partial s\, \partial t_j}\right|_{s=0} \right] dt \\
&= \sum_i c_i \int \left[L_x(d\gamma_i) - \sum_j \frac{\partial L_{v_j}(d\gamma_i)}{\partial t_j} \right] \left.\frac{\partial (r_s \circ \gamma_i)}{\partial s}\right|_{s=0} dt \\
&= \sum_i c_i \int (\text{E-L})\, \left.\frac{\partial r_s}{\partial s}\right|_{s=0} dt
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$(\text{E-L}) \coloneqq \frac{\partial L}{\partial x} - \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial x \partial v_i} v_i + \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial v_i \partial v_j} \mathsf{X}_{ij} \right),$$

and a point in the vector space $T_{(v_1,\ldots,v_n)}(T^n_x M)$ has coordinates X_{ij}, $1 \leq i,j \leq n$. Since the above is true for all smooth vectorfields $X = \partial r_s/\partial s|_{s=0}$, we conclude that (E-L) must vanish identically throughout the support of $\mu = \mu_\alpha$.

In other words, Condition (Crit) for measures μ_α and for distributions of the form (13) is equivalent to the Euler-Lagrange equations (E-L).

Remark 27. In the case of an arbitrary holonomic measure (not necessarily induced by a cycle) we have no information about the second derivatives, so we find no clear way to give this deduction in that general case. While it can be ascertained that these equations must be respected in a weak sense (if $\mu = \lim_i \mu_{\alpha_i}$, the measures μ_{α_i} will asymptotically satisfy Euler-Lagrange in the sense of distributions, so (E-L) must vanish μ-almost everywhere), it is not clear to us how this can be useful. □

5.3 Vertical variations

Let μ be a holonomic measure in $T^n M$.

Recall that g is the Riemannian metric on M, and for

$$u = (u_1, \ldots, u_n),\ v = (v_1, \ldots, v_n) \in T^n M$$

let

$$g(u,v) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} g(u_i, v_i).$$

The set of gradients $\nabla_v d\omega$ of exact differential forms (viewed as functions on $T^n M$) is a subspace F of $\mathcal{H}$. The gradient $\nabla_{v_i} f$ of a function on f on $T^n M$ is defined by

$$g(u_i, \nabla_{v_i} f) = \lim_{t\to 0} \frac{f(x, v_1, \ldots, v_i + t u_i, \ldots, v_n) - f(x, v_1, \ldots, v_n)}{t}$$

for all vector fields u_i on M, and $\nabla_v f$ is defined by

$$g((u_1, \ldots, u_n), \nabla_v f) = \sum_i g(u_i, \nabla_{v_i} f).$$

We introduce the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ of all functions

$$u : \operatorname{supp}\mu \subseteq T^n M \to T^n M$$

such that $u(x,v) \in T^n_x M$ for all $(x,v) \in T^n M$, and $\int g(u,u)\, d\mu < +\infty$, where g is the Riemannian metric on M. The inner product in $\mathcal{H}$ is defined by

$$(u, u') = \int g(u, u')\, d\mu.$$

Each function u in $\mathcal{H}$ induces a distribution η^u of the form

$$\langle \eta^u, f \rangle = \int_{T^n M} g(u, \nabla_v f)\, d\mu.$$

for $f \in C_c^\infty(T^n M)$. This distribution clearly satisfies Conditions (Pos) and (Prob). The set of all functions u in $\mathcal{H}$ such that η^u satisfies Condition (Hol) as well are exactly the orthogonal complement $F^\perp$ to F in $\mathcal{H}$ because Condition (Hol) is

$$0 = \langle \eta^u, d\omega \rangle = \int g(u, \nabla_v d\omega)\, d\mu = (u, d\omega).$$

for $\omega \in \Omega^{n-1}(M)$.

It follows that, if Condition (Crit) is satisfied for all η^u satisfying Conditions (Pos), (Hol), and (Prob), then $\nabla_v L$ must be contained in the space $F^{\perp\perp}$, which coincides with the topological closure $\overline{F}$. We have proved

Proposition 28 ("$L_v = d\omega$")**.** *If μ is a holonomic measure that is critical for A_L, then there exist a sequence $\{\omega^i\}_i \subset \Omega^{n-1}(M)$ such that*

$$\nabla_v L|_{\operatorname{supp}\mu} = \lim_{i\to\infty} \nabla_v d\omega^i.$$

The limit is taken in $\mathcal{H}$. □

It is possible to produce an explicit variation μ_t^u of μ with derivative η^u by letting

$$\int_{T^n M} f\, d\mu_s^u = \int_{T^n M} f(x, v + su(x,v))\, d\mu(x,v)$$

for all $f \in C_c^\infty(T^n M)$ and $s \in \mathbb{R}$. It follows from the construction that this variation preserves homology whenever Condition (Hom) holds. That is, whenever u is such that

$$0 = \langle \eta^u, \omega \rangle = (u, \omega)$$

for all closed forms $\omega \in \Omega^n(M)$. Hence, the same argument as before yields

Proposition 29. *If μ is a holonomic measure that is critical for A_L within its homology class, then there exists a sequence of closed n-forms $\{\omega^i\}_i \subset \Omega^n(M)$, $d\omega^i = 0$, such that*

$$\nabla_v L|_{\operatorname{supp}\mu} = \lim_{i\to\infty} \nabla_v \omega^i.$$

The limit is taken in $\mathcal{H}$. □

5.4 Transpositional variations

Let $\mu \in \mathscr{H}$ again be a holonomic measure, and let L be a Lagrangian. We will define a type of variation that constitutes for holonomic measures the analogue of a reparameterization, and we will deduce a version of Noether's theorem.

Let $\sigma \in C_c^\infty(T^nM)$ and fix some $1 \leq i \leq n$. We consider the distribution on T^nM given by

$$\langle \eta, f \rangle = \int \sigma f \, d\mu - \int \sigma \, g(v_i, \nabla_{v_i} f) \, d\mu - \int f \, d\mu \int \sigma \, d\mu$$

for $f \in C_c^\infty(T^nM)$. The distribution η clearly satisfies Conditions (Pos) and (Prob). To see that it also satisfies Condition (Hol), we compute, for $\omega \in \Omega^{n-1}(M)$,

$$\langle \eta, d\omega \rangle = \int \sigma \, d\omega \, d\mu - \int \sigma \, d\omega \, d\mu - \int d\omega \, d\mu \int \sigma \, d\mu = 0.$$

Here, we used that $g(v_i, \nabla_{v_i} d\omega) = d\omega$ by linearity, and we also used the fact that μ is holonomic.

If μ is critical for A_L, it must satisfy Condition (Crit) for all variations arising in this way from any $\sigma \in C_c^\infty(T^nM)$. This translates to

$$0 = \langle \eta, L \rangle = \int \sigma L \, d\mu - \int \sigma \, g(v_i, \nabla_{v_i} L) \, d\mu - \int L \, d\mu \int \sigma \, d\mu.$$

If the domain of σ is very small around a point $(x, v) \in T^nM$, this can be very well approximated by

$$0 \approx \int \sigma \, d\mu \left(L(x,v) - g(v_i, \nabla_{v_i} L(x,v)) - \int L \, d\mu \right).$$

This is how we deduce

Proposition 30 (Energy conservation)**.** *If a holonomic measure is critical with respect to all transpositional variations, then its support is a subset of the set where*

$$g(v_i, \nabla_{v_i} L) - L = -A_L(\mu).$$

□

Remark 31. In the cases in which we can define the change of variables $p_i = L_{v_i}$ (for example, in the case of convex, superlinear Lagrangians), we can also define the Hamiltonians

$$H_i(x, p_i) = H_i(x, p_i; v_1, \ldots, \widehat{v_i}, \ldots, v_n) = p_i v_i - L(x, v_1, \ldots, v_n),$$

and what we have here is just a higher-dimensional version of the usual energy conservation principle. □

Remark 32 (Hamilton-Jacobi equation). It follows from Propositions 28 and 30 that $g(v_i, \nabla_{v_i} L)$ is independent of i and equal to $\lim_k d\omega^k$ on $\operatorname{supp}\mu$. Hence also

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} H_i(x, d\omega^k) = -A_L(\mu)$$

on $\operatorname{supp}\mu$, for all i. This is a generalized form of the Hamilton-Jacobi equation. This situation is very similar to the weak KAM theorem of Fathi [19], with the important caveat that we have proved nothing about the regularity of the limit of the forms ω^k. □

The distribution η is in fact the derivative of the variation μ_t^σ given by

$$\int f\, d\mu_t^\sigma = -\frac{\int (1-t\sigma) f(x, v_1, \ldots, v_{i-1}, (1-t\sigma)^{-1} v_i, v_{i+1}, \ldots, v_n)\, d\mu}{\int (1-t\sigma)\, d\mu}$$

for $f \in C_c^\infty(T^n M)$ and for t in an open interval that contains 0.

If we require the variation μ_t^σ to preserve homology, then we find that we must require $\int \sigma\, d\mu = 0$ because

$$\int \omega\, d\mu_t^\sigma = \frac{\langle \rho(\mu), \omega \rangle}{\int (1-t\sigma)\, d\mu}$$

must be constant for each closed form $\omega \in \Omega^n(M)$, $d\omega = 0$. It follows that if μ is critical for A_L within its homology class then it must satisfy

$$\int \sigma (L - L_{v_i} \cdot v_i)\, d\mu = 0$$

for all σ with $\int \sigma\, d\mu = 0$. We can use $\sigma d\mu$ to approximate the derivative at any point in $\operatorname{supp}\mu$ arbitrarily well. Hence, we get

Proposition 33 (Energy conservation for homological minimizers)**.** *If a holonomic measure is critical for A_L within its homology class, then for each connected component K of* $\operatorname{supp}\mu$ *there are some $c_1, \ldots, c_n \in \mathbb{R}$ such that K is contained in the set where*

$$L - g(v_i, \nabla_{v_i} L) = c_i, \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, n.$$

References

[1] William K. Allard. On the first variation of a varifold. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 95:417–491, 1972.

[2] Frederick J. Almgren, Jr. *Plateau's problem: An invitation to varifold geometry*. W. A. Benjamin, Inc., New York-Amsterdam, 1966.

[3] Luigi Ambrosio, Nicola Gigli, and Giuseppe Savaré. *Gradient flows in metric spaces and in the space of probability measures*. Lectures in Mathematics ETH Zürich. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, second edition, 2008.

[4] Luigi Ambrosio, Nicola Gigli, and Giuseppe Savaré. *Gradient flows in metric spaces and in the space of probability measures*. Lectures in Mathematics ETH Zürich. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, second edition, 2008.

[5] V. Bangert. Minimal measures and minimizing closed normal one-currents. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 9(3):413–427, 1999.

[6] Patrick Bernard. Young measures, superposition and transport. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 57(1):247–275, 2008.

[7] Jean-François Colombeau. *New generalized functions and multiplication of distributions*, volume 84 of *North-Holland Mathematics Studies*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1984. Notas de Matemática [Mathematical Notes], 90.

[8] Jean-François Colombeau. *Multiplication of distributions*, volume 1532 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1992. A tool in mathematics, numerical engineering and theoretical physics.

[9] Gonzalo Contreras and Renato Iturriaga. *Global minimizers of autonomous Lagrangians*. 22º Colóquio Brasileiro de Matemática. [22nd Brazilian Mathematics Colloquium]. Instituto de Matemática Pura e Aplicada (IMPA), Rio de Janeiro, 1999.

[10] Michael G. Crandall and Pierre-Louis Lions. Viscosity solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 277(1):1–42, 1983.

[11] Bernard Dacorogna. *Introduction to the calculus of variations*. Imperial College Press, London, second edition, 2009. Translated from the 1992 French original.

[12] Guy David. Should we solve Plateau's problem again? In C. Fefferman, A. D. Ionescu, D. H. Phong, and S. Wainger, editors, *Advances in Analysis: the legacy of Elias M. Stein*. Princeton University Press, 2014.

[13] Camillo De Lellis, Francesco Ghiraldin, and Francesco Maggi. A direct approach to plateau's problem.

[14] Thierry De Pauw. Size minimizing surfaces. *Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. (4)*, 42(1):37–101, 2009.

[15] Guido De Philippis, Antonio De Rosa, and Francesco Ghiraldin. A direct approach to Plateau's problem in any codimension.

[16] James Eells, Jr. and J. H. Sampson. Harmonic mappings of Riemannian manifolds. *Amer. J. Math.*, 86:109–160, 1964.

[17] Lawrence C. Evans. Quasiconvexity and partial regularity in the calculus of variations. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 95(3):227–252, 1986.

[18] Yangqin Fang. Existence of minimizers for the Reifenberg Plateau problem.

[19] Albert Fathi. Weak KAM theorem in lagrangian dynamics. Preliminary Version Number 10, June 2008.

[20] Herbert Federer. *Geometric measure theory*. Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, Band 153. Springer-Verlag New York Inc., New York, 1969.

[21] Vincent Feuvrier. Condensation of polyhedric structures onto soap films.

[22] F. G. Friedlander. *Introduction to the theory of distributions*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, second edition, 1998. With additional material by M. Joshi.

[23] Enrico Giusti. *Direct methods in the calculus of variations*. World Scientific Publishing Co., Inc., River Edge, NJ, 2003.

[24] Jenny Harrison. Operator calculus of differential chains and differential forms.

[25] Jenny Harrison. Soap film solutions to Plateau's problem.

[26] Jenny Harrison and Harrison Pugh. Existence and soap film regularity of solutions to Plateau's problem.

[27] Jürgen Jost. *Riemannian geometry and geometric analysis*. Universitext. Springer, Heidelberg, sixth edition, 2011.

[28] Jan Kristensen and Giuseppe Mingione. The singular set of minima of integral functionals. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 180(3):331–398, 2006.

[29] Gian Paolo Leonardi and Simon Masnou. Locality of the mean curvature of rectifiable varifolds. *Adv. Calc. Var.*, 2(1):17–42, 2009.

[30] Francesco Maggi. *Sets of finite perimeter and geometric variational problems*, volume 135 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2012. An introduction to geometric measure theory.

[31] Ricardo Mañé. *Ergodic theory and differentiable dynamics*, volume 8 of *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete (3) [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas (3)]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1987. Translated from the Portuguese by Silvio Levy.

[32] John N. Mather. Action minimizing invariant measures for positive definite Lagrangian systems. *Math. Z.*, 207(2):169–207, 1991.

[33] Frank Morgan. *Geometric measure theory*. Elsevier/Academic Press, Amsterdam, fourth edition, 2009. A beginner's guide.

[34] Jürgen Moser. Minimal solutions of variational problems on a torus. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 3(3):229–272, 1986.

[35] Jürgen Moser. A stability theorem for minimal foliations on a torus. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 8*(Charles Conley Memorial Issue):251–281, 1988.

[36] Jürgen Moser. Minimal foliations on a torus. In *Topics in calculus of variations (Montecatini Terme, 1987)*, volume 1365 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 62–99. Springer, Berlin, 1989.

[37] E. R. Reifenberg. Solution of the Plateau Problem for m-dimensional surfaces of varying topological type. *Acta Math.*, 104:1–92, 1960.

[38] E. R. Reifenberg. An epiperimetric inequality related to the analyticity of minimal surfaces. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 80:1–14, 1964.

[39] E. R. Reifenberg. On the analyticity of minimal surfaces. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 80:15–21, 1964.

[40] Rodolfo Ríos-Zertuche. Polygonal approximations of closed parametric varifolds. Preprint. arXiv:1409.1205 [math.AP].

[41] Leon Simon. *Lectures on geometric measure theory*, volume 3 of *Proceedings of the Centre for Mathematical Analysis, Australian National University*. Australian National University Centre for Mathematical Analysis, Canberra, 1983.

[42] O. G. Smolyanov and H. von Weizsäcker. Differentiable families of measures. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 118(2):454–476, 1993.

[43] L. C. Young. *Lectures on the calculus of variations and optimal control theory*. Foreword by Wendell H. Fleming. W. B. Saunders Co., Philadelphia, 1969.